

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 15-20, 22 and 23 have been amended to improve form. Claims 1, 2 and 4-23 remain pending in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9 and 11-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chaturvedi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,500; hereinafter Chaturvedi '500); claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9 and 11-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chaturvedi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,501; hereinafter Chaturvedi '500); and claims 5 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Chaturvedi '500 or Chaturvedi '501 in view of Battin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0199019; hereinafter Battin). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9 and 11-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chaturvedi '500 and Chaturvedi '501. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method for providing communication services that includes receiving a request from a hearing-impaired party for establishing a communication link. Claim 1 recites establishing, by the communication assistant, a communication link to the hearing-impaired party using a text messaging program, wherein the communication link between the hearing-impaired party and the communication assistant comprises a persistent, full duplex link. Claim 1, as amended, recites that the persistent, full duplex link is configured to allow each of the communication assistant and the hearing-impaired party to view text generated by the other respective party in a streaming manner.

The Office Action states that Chaturvedi '500 discloses establishing a link between the hearing-impaired party and the communication assistant and points to col. 7, lines 34-44 for support (Office Action – page 2). The Office Action also states that Chaturvedi '501 discloses establishing a link between the hearing-impaired party and the communication assistant and points to col. 7, lines 27-53 for support (Office Action – page 4).

Chaturvedi '500 and '501 may each disclose forming a full duplex link between a communication assistant and a hearing-impaired party. However, neither Chaturvedi '500 nor Chaturvedi '501 discloses or suggests that the link between the hearing-impaired party 12 and the message translator 24 is configured to allow each of the communication assistant and the hearing-impaired party to view text generated by the other respective party in a streaming manner, as required by amended claim 1.

As discussed in the applicants' specification at, for example, paragraph 37, using a persistent, full duplex link configured to allow the communication assistant and hearing-impaired parties to view messages generated in a streaming manner allows the respective parties to view the text from the other party as it is being typed. Chaturvedi '500 or '501 does not disclose or suggest establishing a persistent, full duplex link that is configured in this manner to allow the parties to view messages in a streaming manner.

Claim 1, as amended, also recites generating text messages corresponding to the voice messages and transmitting the text messages to the hearing-impaired party in a streaming manner. Chaturvedi '500 or '501 does not disclose or suggest this feature.

For at least these reasons, Chaturvedi '500 does not disclose or suggest each of the features of amended claim 1 and Chaturvedi '501 does not disclose or suggest each of

the features of amended claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 6 and 7 are dependent on claim 1 and are believed to be allowable over Chaturvedi '500 and '501 for at least the reasons claim 1 is allowable. In addition, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by either Chaturvedi '500 or '501.

For example, claim 4, as amended, recites receiving, by the communication assistant, text messages from the hearing-impaired party in a streaming manner. Neither Chaturvedi '500 or '501 discloses or suggests this feature.

For at least this additional reason, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 15, 18 and 20, as amended, recite features similar to, but not identical to claim 1. For reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 8, 15, 18 and 21 are respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 21-23 variously depend on claims 8, 15, 18 and 20 and are believed to be allowable over Chaturvedi '500 and Chaturvedi '501 for at least the reasons their respective independent claims are allowable. In addition, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by either Chaturvedi '500 or Chaturvedi '501.

For example, claim 9, as amended, recites that the first device is configured to transmit text messages to the wireless device in a streaming manner and receive text messages from the hearing-impaired party in a streaming manner via the wireless device. Claim 17 recites similar, but not identical features as claim 9. Neither Chaturvedi '500

nor Chaturvedi '501 discloses or suggests these features. For at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 9 and 17 are respectfully requested.

Claim 23, as amended, recites communicating with the hearing-impaired party by transmitting image data from a communication assistant to the wireless device. The Office Action states that Chaturvedi '500 and '501 disclose transmitting interface screens to the hearing-impaired party and points to col. 6, lines 8-18 of Chaturvedi '500 and col. 6, lines 16-29 of Chaturvedi '501 for support (Office Action – pages 3 and 4). The applicants assume that the interface screens are alleged to be equivalent to image data.

Chaturvedi '500 and '501 each disclose that the web server 32 administers a web site that has a display interface that may be provided to a hearing-impaired party 12. Claim 23, as amended however, recites communicating with the hearing-impaired party by transmitting image data from a communication assistant to the wireless device. Chaturvedi '500 and '501 does not disclose or suggest that message translator 24 transmits image data to the hearing-impaired party.

For at least this additional reason, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 23 are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaturvedi '500 or '501 in view of Battin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0199019; hereinafter Battin). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 10 are dependent on claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons their respective independent claims are allowable.

Battin does not remedy the deficiencies in either Chaturvedi '500 or Chaturvedi '501 discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 10 is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-2347 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: 
Glenn Snyder
Reg. No. 41,428

Date: March 8, 2006

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (571) 432-0800
Facsimile: (571) 432-0808